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Causal Inference in HIV Prevention Trials

• Suppose an exposure (or treatment) associated with rate of HIV acquisition in a study
• Eg, contraceptive associated (p<.05!) with lower HIV incid.
• When can we conclude that such an association is due to exposure actually having an **effect** on HIV infection?
• Causal inference methods provide a formal statistical framework for deducing casual claims from data
Causal Inference

- Long history in philosophy
- Early statistical work by Neyman in 1920s, then important work by Rubin 1970s and Robins 1980s lead to modern era where commonly used approach in numerous disciplines
- Important (arguably fundamental) in epidemiology, econometrics, comparative effectiveness research, implementation science, public policy, and many other areas of research
- Books, journals, conferences, courses, software, blogs
Causal Inference in Epidemiology
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Ruth H. Keogh, Rhian M. Daniel, Tyler J. VanderWeele, and Stijn Vansteelandt

Research Letter

Inverse Probability Weights for the Analysis of Polytomous Outcomes
HPTN is in the causal inference business

- The HIV Prevention Trials Network is a worldwide collaborative clinical trials network that develops and tests the safety and efficacy of interventions designed to prevent the transmission of HIV
- HPTN: learn about the causal effects of interventions on safety and HIV transmission outcomes
Outline

• A gentle introduction to drawing causal inference using data from biomedical studies
• Cover basic ideas like potential outcomes, counterfactuals, confounding, propensity score, etc
• Examples from HIV prevention studies
Potential Outcomes

- Binary treatment (exposure) with values $A = 0,1$
- For example, $A = 1$ treatment, $A = 0$ no treatment (control)
- Consider two potential outcomes
  - $Y(1)$ if individual receives treatment
  - $Y(0)$ if individual receives control
- Eg, $Y(a) = 1$ if individual HIV+ after 5 years for $a = 0,1$
Causal Effects

- If $Y(1) = Y(0)$, then treatment has no (causal) effect
- Otherwise, treatment has an effect

- Typically we only observe $Y(1)$ or $Y(0)$ but not both
- Eg if individual receives treatment $A = 1$, we observe $Y(1)$, and $Y(0)$ becomes counterfactual (missing)
- Thus estimating effect at individual level generally not possible
Causal Effects

• Consider estimating effects at the population level such as average treatment effect

\[ E[Y(1) - Y(0)] = E[Y(1)] - E[Y(0)] \]

• Interpretation:
  – Average individual-level effect of treatment
  – Difference in average outcome if everyone receives treatment versus if no one receives treatment (two counterfactual scenarios)
Causal Effects

• Consider estimating effects at the population level such as average treatment effect

\[ E[Y(1) - Y(0)] = E[Y(1)] - E[Y(0)] \]

• For binary outcome, consider causal RD or RR

\[ \text{Pr}[Y(1) = 1] - \text{Pr}[Y(0) = 1] \text{ or } \frac{\text{Pr}[Y(1) = 1]}{\text{Pr}[Y(0) = 1]} \]
Randomized experiments

• Suppose we randomly assign individuals to treatment
• Treatment assignment $A$ is independent of $Y(1)$ and $Y(0)$
  \[ A \perp Y(1), Y(0) \]
• Denote the observed outcome by $Y$, e.g., $Y = Y(1)$ if $A = 1$
• Then $E[Y(1)] = E[Y(1)|A = 1] = E[Y|A = 1]$
• Thus can estimate $E[Y(1)]$ by the mean outcome in individuals randomized to treatment; likewise for $E[Y(0)]$
Randomized experiments

- Therefore we can estimate the average treatment effect
  \[ E[Y(1) - Y(0)] = E[Y(1)] - E[Y(0)] \]
  by difference in sample means (t-test), or by fitting a simple linear regression model
  \[ E[Y|A] = b_0 + b_1 A \]
- Upshot: causal inference straightforward in randomized trials
Randomized experiments

• Proviso: Randomized experiments often include issues like drop-out, non-compliance, measurement error, etc
Randomized experiments

• In addition, we may be interested in secondary analyses of trial data where the treatment/exposure was not randomized, or in mediation (causal pathways)
Observational studies

- Consider a study where treatment received is not randomized, so we are no longer willing to assume $A \perp Y(1), Y(0)$

- Eg, $A = \text{contraceptive}, Y = \text{incident HIV infection}$

- Women who are more sexually active may be more likely to use contraceptive ($A = 1$) and may also be more likely, regardless of treatment, to acquire HIV ($Y(1) = Y(0) = 1$)
Observational studies

- Directed acyclic graphs (DAGs) often used in causal inference to depict assumptions
- \( L \) sexual behavior, \( A \) oral contraceptive, \( Y \) HIV infection

\[
L \longrightarrow A \longrightarrow Y
\]

- \( L \) confounds the association between \( A \) and \( Y \)
- In general, \( A \) will not be independent of \( Y(0), Y(1) \)
Observational studies

• However, suppose we only consider women with the same sexual behavior

![Diagram](L \rightarrow A \rightarrow Y)

• We might be willing to assume that $A \perp Y(1), Y(0) \mid L$
• In other words, within strata defined by $L$, as-if randomized trial
Observational studies

• Key assumption

\[ A \perp Y(1), Y(0) \mid L \]

might be more plausible if condition on additional covariates

• Conditional on age, race, ethnicity, sexual behavior, education, etc, women who select OC similar to women who do not

• Conditional exchangeability, or

no unmeasured confounders assumption
Observational studies

• Conditional exchangeability key assumption underlying most causal inference methods
• Within strata defined by covariates $L = (L_1, L_2, ...)$, as-if randomized trial
• Recall: causal inference in randomized studies easy
• Implication: estimate causal effects within strata, then average estimates across strata
• Essential idea between many matching methods and standardization/g-formula
Can’t I just do multivariate regression?

- What if we fit this model?
  \[ E[Y|A, L] = b_0 + b_1 A + b_2 L \]
- Is \( \hat{b}_1 \) valid estimate of the causal effect?
- Yes, if model correct
- But model supposes effect of treatment same for all individuals, which will be implausible in many settings
Propensity score

- **Propensity score** is conditional probability individual receives treatment given covariates \( e(L) = \Pr[A = 1|L] \)
- Important result. Conditional exchangeability implies \( A \perp Y(1), Y(0) | e(L) \)
- That is, if it is sufficient to adjust/control for \( L \), then it is sufficient to match/stratify by \( e(L) \)
- Advantageous because \( e(L) \) is just a scalar
Propensity score

- Propensity score generally unknown in observational studies
- Estimate via logistic regression \( \text{logit}(\Pr[A = 1]) = a_1 + a_2 L \)
- Stratify or match individuals based on estimate propensity scores
- Estimate causal effects within strata/matches, then average over effect estimates
Inverse Probability Weighting

- Another common approach using propensity scores
- Estimate via logistic regression $\logit(\Pr[A = 1]) = a_1 + a_2 L$
- Estimate $E[Y(1)]$ by weighted average of $Y$ among treated individuals $A = 1$ with weights $1/e(L)$
- Similarly for $E[Y(0)]$
- Creates pseudo-population where no confounding
Other areas of causal inference

• Mediation

Assessing the effect of hormonal contraception on HIV acquisition in observational data: challenges and recommended analytic approaches

Chelsea B. Polis\textsuperscript{a,*}, Daniel Westreich\textsuperscript{b,c,*}, Jennifer E. Balkus\textsuperscript{d,e,*}, Renee Hefiron\textsuperscript{e,*}, participants of the 2013 HC-HIV Observational Analysis Meeting

* AIDS 2013, 27 (Suppl 1):S35–S43
Other areas of causal inference

- Mediation
- Time-varying exposures

\[ A(0) \text{ ART at visit 0} \]
\[ L(1) \text{ CD4 at visit 1} \]
\[ A(1) \text{ ART at visit 1} \]
Other areas of causal inference

• Mediation
• Time-varying exposures
• Instrumental variables:
  – $IV$ – $Y$ unconfounded, and
  – $IV$ has an effect on $Y$ only via $A$
Other areas of causal inference

• Mediation
• Time-varying exposures
• Instrumental variables
• Regression discontinuity designs
Other areas of causal inference

- Mediation
- Time-varying exposures
- Instrumental variables
- Regression discontinuity designs
- Principal stratification

\( D(1) \) indicator if person would adhere when assigned treatment
Casual Effects (Revisited)

• Recall causal effect definition: all individuals exposed vs no individuals exposed
• Other quantities may be more relevant from policy/public health perspective
• Effect of treatment in treated
• E.g., smoking
Conclusion

• Causal inference central to mission of HPTN
• Straightforward in randomized studies w/ perfect compliance, etc
• Specialized statistical methods for observational studies
  – Matching, stratification/standardization
  – Inverse probability weighting
• Can utilize these methods in HPTN trials with imperfect compliance, LTFU, exposures that were not randomized, mediation analysis, etc.
Causal Inference Resources

- Books ([Hernan and Robins](#), [Imbens and Rubin](#), …)
- Journals ([Journal of Causal Inference](#))
- Software ([SAS Proc Causaltrt](#), R packages, …)
- Conferences ([Atlantic CI Conference](#), [EuroCIM](#), …)
- Short courses ([UW SISMID](#) July 23-25, [Harvard](#) June 4-8)
For more information or to apply for a scholarship: biostat.washington.edu/suminst
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